

SENATOR GOODRICH: The answer is no.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Who asked you to introduce it?

SENATOR GOODRICH: During the constitutional amendment promotion to raise the pay for Senators, we bumped into the fact that the corporations that dealt in liquor would not make contributions to the promotion of pay raise for Senators because of the fact that that section of statutes was on the books and it would literally jeopardize their license. So, consequently, they hid behind that even though it was an unconstitutional section of the statutes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Senator Goodrich, then it seems to me that what is being presented here is in the first place to get the liquor industry to help the Senators get a pay raise. I can't see anything more direct than that as an effort to try to influence legislation, perhaps, even improperly. The provision that we have before us now is saying, in exchange for you donating money to help the Senators get a raise, we will take away this provision that does not allow you to contribute to any political campaign. Then not only can you give money to help the Senators get a raise, you can put your candidates in who want to help deregulate the industry, too. If the liquor industry were concerned about and if they were certain that it is unconstitutional as you indicate that it is, then I am certain the liquor industry would have brought a suit to see that this discrimination against them is taken off but they are not as sure as you are. Maybe they don't even want the provision taken off but I think the liquor industry is one of those which is amenable to a type of regulation which others are not. If the liquor industry can openly give to campaigns, then as was suggested by the very young colleague of mine, then perhaps dope pushers ought to be given recognition as being allowed to do this, too, and the people who are considered to be connected with organized crime. The only reason the alcohol and liquor industry is not openly criminal is because it is highly regulated. It is the kind of substance which lends itself to illegality. Not only can the money which is produced by it influence people's conduct and their votes, the substance itself can do that, and if you gave me enough of it and I could use it in the way that I chose and distribute it as I chose, I could alter votes in this body and that is well known. I don't see the need for this provision, and if the only argument Senator Goodrich can give for it is that when they were trying to get people to donate to get the Senators a raise, they ran into a provision which would stop the liquor industry from so donating, that certainly is not a justification. That is an argument for keeping it just as it is. And I don't see the pressing need to remove this particular regulation just like I don't see the need to remove any other regulation from the liquor industry.

SENATOR MARVEL: Senator Goodrich, there are no other lights on. Do you wish to close?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Very briefly. This danger that Senator Chambers refers to in the liquor industry is no different than the danger, for example, of banks making contributions to political campaigns, auto dealers, grocers, anyone else you want to name. There is absolutely no difference in whether